

Message

From: Beck, Whitney [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=95A55FA866614CF99239EF6C3509B71E-BECK, WHITN]
Sent: 1/11/2021 8:02:21 PM
To: Trombley, Michael [Trombley.Michael@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: OP review of FL FRN
Attachments: 10018-76-OW_admin_01-11-2021.docx

Hey Mike,

Is there a quick way that we can fix a minor typo that OP caught in our FL 404 FRN? See my message to Mindy below.

Shari said water policy staff would have to forward a new FRN to OP but we don't want to slow the process down because of a tiny typo. I have a version of the FRN that incorporates Shari's edit (attached) plus I removed an extra space that was accidentally included in the hyperlink on the top of the Stat/EO section on p. 6. Would this need to go into CMS or is there a more streamlined option?

Thanks for your help!

Whitney

From: Beck, Whitney
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 2:26 PM
To: Eisenberg, Mindy <Eisenberg.Mindy@epa.gov>
Cc: Hurlid, Kathy <Hurlid.Kathy@epa.gov>
Subject: OP review of FL FRN

Hi Mindy,

OP is in the process of reviewing our FRN. Shari noticed a typo on p. 3:

A new notice and comment process ~~are~~ is unnecessary because it would neither provide new information to the public nor provide the Agency with information that would be helpful in developing a final rule.

She said if we want to fix it, there is normally a lull between water policy staff review and AA review, so this would be a good time when we can send a new version of the FRN to OP via our water policy staff. I can see why the sentence was written the original way but agree that "is" seems more grammatically correct. If we do that, I'm also going to delete an extra space I noticed in one of our hyperlinks.

Thanks!!
Whitney

From: Grossarth, Shari <Grossarth.Shari@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2021 1:53 PM
To: Beck, Whitney <beck.whitney@epa.gov>
Subject: response to comments on Florida's 404 program approval?

Hi Whitney,

Do you have a response to comment document from Florida's 404 program approval? I was just looking for one in the docket but can't find it. I'm reviewing the action codifying Florida's program approval, and even though the comments on the approval are separate, I just want to be prepared in case I'm asked about comments or stakeholder response to approval. If you don't have a response to comment document, do you have something that summarizes stakeholder reactions to approval?

Also, I'm going to go ahead and approve the codification package, but I just wanted to let you know I noticed one minor typo (at least it is to me) that you might want to check before signature. See attached p 3—since process is singular.

Thanks! Shari
202-566-2242